ᄂ1

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/842,753	04/25/2001	Outi Aho	460-010296-US(PAR)	8264

7590   05/04/2007

Clarence A. Green
Perman & Green, LLP
425 Post Road
Fairfield, CT 06430

EXAMINER
NAWAZ, ASAD M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2155	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
05/04/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

<table>
<tr>
<td rowspan="2">Office Action Summary</td>
<td>Application No.

09/842,753</td>
<td>Applicant(s)

AHO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examiner

Asad M. Nawaz</td>
<td>Art Unit

2155</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</table>

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>18 January 2007</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-17</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-17</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date 9\10\01

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

     Office Action Summary   Part of Paper No./Mail Date 20070425

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is responsive to the amendment received 1/18/07. Claims 1, 9, and

17 were amended. No new claims were added. No claims have been canceled.

Accordingly, claims 1-17 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2.   The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly
> claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3.   Claims 1-17 recite the limitation "the information to be transmitted" in claim 1.

There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public
> use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United
> States.

5.   Claims 1-3, 5-11, and 13-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being

anticipated by Gleeson et al, 5,627,829, (hereafter Gleeson).

        As per claim 1, Gleeson teaches a method for transmitting information between

applications executed in a first and a second data transmission device in a data

transmission system (col. 6, lines 40-42), the method comprising: using a data

transmission protocol in the information transmission performing one or more protocol

conversions in the protocol stack for the information to be transmitted (col. 10, lines 27-

30, 40-46; protocols are converted into compatible formats that can be transmitted

between application devices), said protocol stack comprising at least an application

layer and a physical layer (200, 208, figure 2; protocol stack comprises plurality of

layers such as application, physical, etc.); and transmitting messages between the first

data transmission device and the second transmission device, the transmitting

comprising completely forming messages in the application layer from the information to

be transmitted (col. 6, lines 47-56; message data are generated in the application layer

to be transmitted over the network).

Claims 9 and 17 are rejected by similar rationale as claim 1.

As per claims 2-3 and 10-11, Gleeson teaches transmitting at least two types of

components in the messages, wherein the messages contain information on the type of

the message transmitted in the message (1530, '1532, fig. 15; col. 16, lines 15-17; type

and sequence number subfields are components of the data packet being transmitted

between the devices); a header field, on the basis of which the type of the message is

determined (col. 15, line 65 - col, 16, line 2; data packet includes a header field that

includes the type subfield that defines the type of the packet).

As per claims 5 and 13, Gleeson teaches providing messages with a data field to

transmit information produced in the application (1408, fig. 14a, col. 15, line 35; data

field is a component of the data packet).

As per claims 6 and 14, Gleeson teaches using the protocol stack at least a session layer between the application layer and the physical layer (600, 604, 614, fig. 6; session layer is between the application and physical layers in the protocol stack), in which the protocol used therein contains data frames, containing at least a header field and a data field (data packet contains header and data fields), wherein the method further comprises transferring messages produced in the application layer to the data field of the data frames of the session layer (col. 6, lines 47-56; col-. 15, lines 26-36; message data is generated in the application layer; message data is transferred to the data field of the data packet to be transmitted to another device).

As per claims 7 and 15, Gleeson teaches using WAP system at least as the data transmission system (col. 10, lines 27-30; radio modem protocol 'RM' is functionally equivalent to wireless application protocol WAR).

As per claims 8 and 16, Gleeson teaches using the Internet data transmission network at least partly used as the data transmission system (col. 11, lines 27-29; transmission control protocol/Internet protocol 'TCP/IP' allows data to be routed over the Internet).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

7.   Claims 4 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Gleeson and in view of Bhagwat et al, 6,721,805 (hereafter Bhagwat).

As per claims 4 and 12, Gleeson does not explicitly teach dividing said header field at

least into first and second different parts, wherein the first part is used in all messages

and the second part is used, if necessary, in the transmission of the typespecific

information of the message transmitted in the message.

Bhagwat teaches a header field contains plurality of subfields (col. 7, lines 49-57)

and subfields can vary depending on the needs of the user (col. 8, lines 19-23). Hence,

it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skilled in the art to modify and combine

the teachings of Gleeson and Bhagwat to use the desired subfields when required

depending on the type of data being transmitted in order to save bandwidth and

increase the efficiency of data transmission over the networks.

Response to Arguments

8.   Applicant argues in substance, Gleeson does not teach or disclose the

messages being completely formed in the application layer. In response, Gleeson

teaches that messages are constructed from information at the application layer. When

the application layer packet is constructed, it contains information that is different from

messages. Thus, Gleeson still meets the scope of the limitation as currently claimed.

Furthermore, it should be noted that the claim language states the messages are

completely formed *in* the application layer and not completely forming messages *by* the

application layer. The two phrases influence the scope of the claim dramatically. The examiner has interpreted the claim language in its broadest reasonable interpretation. Thus, Gleeson still meets the scope of the limitations as currently claimed.

Conclusion

9.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Asad M. Nawaz whose telephone number is (571) 272-3988. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Saleh Najjar can be reached on (571) 272-4006. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

AMN

SALEH NAJJAR
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER